REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 5, and 14-24 are currently pending, with claims 1, 3, 14 and 19 being the independent claims. Claims 1, 3, 5, 14, 15, 18 and 19 have been amended. Dependent claims 25-28 have been added. Support for new dependent claims 25-28 may be found at pg. 18, lines 3-5 of the specification. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

In the October 5, 2005 Office Action, independent claims 1, 3, 14 and 19, and dependent claims 15 and 20-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,595,859 ("*Lynn*") and U.S. Patent No. 5,996,011 ("*Humes*"). Dependent claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over *Lynn*, *Humes* and U.S. Patent No. 6,580,422 *Reilly*. Dependent claims 16, 17 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over *Lynn* in view of *Humes* and U.S. Patent No. 6,108,637 ("*Blumenau*"). Dependent claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over *Lynn* in view of *Humes*, and Applicant Admitted Prior Art ("*AAPA*"). For the following reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Lynn is directed to an Internet marketing method and game for promoting access to the web site which hosts the game, and to keep potential consumers occupied on the web site for exposure to several different advertisements, or to a few advertisements repeatedly (see Abstract).

The Examiner cites *Humes* in an attempt to cure the shortcomings of *Lynn*, i.e., the failure to teach or suggest "a filter for obscuring the content of each of a plurality of pixels that has a metadata value that exceeds a discretionary threshold value without preventing the display of the content of the plurality of pixels that does not have a metadata value that exceeds the discretionary value". However, the combination of *Humes* and *Lynn* fails to achieve the invention recited in independent claims 1, 3, 14 and 19.

Humes relates to a computer based system and method for filtering text data from World Wide Web pages received by a computer system connected to the Internet (see col. 1, lines 9-11). *Humes* filters out objectionable text content from a downloaded web page. *Humes* (col. 3, lines 10-19) teaches this is achieved by checking a URL against an Allow List and a Deny List. *Humes* (col. 3, lines 23-28) teaches that if the URL is not on either list, then the header of the web page is checked to determine if the web page contains text data. *Humes* (col. 3, lines 2-9) teaches

9

that if the web page contains text data, then the body of the text is filtered to determine the presence of objectionable words. *Humes* (col. 3, lines 28-31) teaches that if objectionable words are found the in the body of the text of the web page, then they may be blocked or filtered out. Hence, *Humes* teaches <u>word-based</u> and <u>text-based</u> filtering. That is, words and text are tested, and it is words and text that may be blocked by the method disclosed in *Hume*.

In contrast, the invention recited in the independent claims of the present application is directed to a system and/or method in which an integrated circuit receives and processes image data for displaying on a display. For each of the pixels shown on the display, the image data comprises both payload data (e.g., content) and metadata. The metadata comprises a value which classifies the pixel independently from the other pixels in the image data. Through this invention, the integrated circuit can perform operations on individual pixels based on their classification (as shown by their metadata). In the present independent claims, pixels forming content that is undesirable or objectionable, such as nudity or violence, can be "obscured" from the final displayed image. The claimed invention is directed to filtering <u>images</u>. *Humes*, in contrast, is directed to filtering <u>text</u>. As a result, the combination of *Humes* and *Lynn* fails achieve the claimed invention, since *Humes* fails to provide what *Lynn* lacks.

Furthermore, *Humes*, either individually or in combination with *Lynn*, fails to teach or suggest that image data for each pixel has two parts: payload (comprising content) and metadata (comprising a value from a predefined set of values). Although *Humes* (col. 3, lines 50-65) teaches that individual words are provided with particular preset values when filtering, these values are found by looking up the word in a dictionary. In contrast, the images of the claimed invention include preset values, because each individual pixel in an image is assigned one of these preset values, i.e., these values are integrated into the image data itself.

Reilly relates to a remote computer display which takes graphics primitives sent over a wireless link and converts the primitives into a graphics display (see col. 1, lines 8-11). *Reilly* fails to cure the deficiency of the system achieved by *Lynn* and *Hume*, since *Reilly* also fails to teach or suggest a system and/or method in which an integrated circuit receives and processes image data for displaying on a display, as recited in independent claims 1, 3, 14 and 19.

Bluemenau relates to a method for monitoring the display of content by a computer system and observation of that content to provide updated and/or tailored content from a content provider site to a content display site so that the content provider's current content is always

displayed at the content display site (see col. 1, lines 4-12). *Bluemenau*, however, fails to provide what the combination of *Lynn*, *Humes* and *Reilly* lacks, since *Bluemenau* also fails to teach or suggest a system and/or method in which an integrated circuit receives and processes image data for displaying on a display, as recited in independent claims 1, 3, 14 and 19.

The Examiner has cited *AAPA* based on the failure of Lynn and/or Hume to teach that payload data comprises a red channel, a blue channel, a green channel, a Z-buffering channel and an alpha channel. However, AAPA in combination with *Lynn*, *Hume* and/or *Bluemenau* fails to teach the present invention, since *AAPA* also failed to teach or suggest the claimed system and/or method of independent claims 1, 3, 14 and 19.

As a result, independent claims 1, 3, 14 and 19 are patentable over the combination of *Lynn*, *Humes*, *Bluemenau* and/or *AAPA* and therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of all the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103 are in order, and a notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

In view of the patentability of independent claims 1, 3, 14 and 19 for the reasons set forth above, dependent claims 5, 15-18 and 20-24, as well as new dependent claims 25-28 are all patentable over the prior art.

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application should be in condition for allowance. Early passage of this case to issue is respectfully requested.

It is believed that no fees or charges are required at this time in connection with the present application. However, if any fees or charges are required at this time, they may be charged to our Patent and Trademark Office Deposit Account No. 03-2412.

Respectfully submitted,

COHEN, PONTANI, LIEBERMAN & PAVANE

By _____
Michael C. Stuart
Reg. No. 35,698
551 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1210
New York, New York 10176
(212) 687-2770

Dated: January 9, 2006